1	[Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	In re LIDODERM ANTITRUST LITIGATION	MDL Docket No. C-14-md-02521 WHO	
12	This document relates to ALL CASES	STIPULATION AND ORDER AMENDING SCHEDULE	
13	This document relates to THE CTIONS	(Civil Local Rule 6.2, 7.12)	
14			
15			
16			
17 18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

The parties stipulate, subject to this Court's approval, and hereby jointly move to extend the date for close of fact discovery by 90 days, from January 28, 2016 to April 27, 2016, and to advance all dates accordingly. The reasons are as follows:

- 1. This multi-party antitrust case requires the production and review of hundreds of thousands of documents, and the taking of many depositions the parties have allocated up to 40 depositions for each side. Discovery in this action has been particularly complex because of the substantial number of documents withheld by the parties on grounds of privilege, and the responsibility of counsel to evaluate and meet and confer concerning the claims of privilege, and to seek to resolve privilege issues before taking depositions. In addition, the parties have encountered challenges in scheduling depositions, which require the coordination of the calendars of multiple counsel as well as witnesses, some of whom are former employees of the defendants.
- 2. On January 15, 2015, prior to the opening of discovery, the Court entered a Stipulated Scheduling Order setting forth a case schedule through trial, including a fact discovery cutoff of October 28, 2015. [Doc. No. 134]. On August 5, 2015, the Court entered an Order, at the request of the parties, amending the case schedule by extending the fact discovery cut-off date by 90 days and extending subsequent dates. [Doc. No. 245].
- 3. The parties have diligently pursued their document production and review obligations, seeking to obtain and produce documents in a timely fashion, and to address disputes concerning privilege claims cooperatively or, when necessary, with the assistance of the Court, before beginning depositions.
- 4. While the parties' efforts to address privilege issues are ongoing, the parties have also scheduled certain depositions. The parties currently have firm dates for 12 depositions to be taken in December and January, and are continuing to work on scheduling others.
- 5. The parties have met and conferred and believe, subject to the Court's approval, that permitting the parties to continue their work on privilege issues, while at the same time taking depositions in an orderly manner, with sufficient time between depositions to evaluate the testimony, will promote the efficient use of resources. The parties believe an additional 90 days of fact discovery is necessary to permit the fair and efficient completion of discovery in preparation for trial.

Accordingly, the parties stipulate, subject to approval of the Court, that the schedule for the close of fact discovery and remaining dates on the case schedule, should be amended as follows:

Event	Current Date	Amended Date
Close of fact discovery. All discovery requests must be served to be answerable by this date, except for requests for admissions, which may be served up to 45 days before Rule 56 and Daubert motions are filed	January 28, 2016	April 27, 2016
Plaintiffs to file motions for class certification and class certification expert reports.	February 18, 2016	May 18, 2016
Defendants to file oppositions to motions for class certification and opposing class certification expert reports.	April 20, 2016	July 19, 2016
Plaintiffs file reply briefs in support of motions for class certification and rebuttal class certification expert reports.	June 9, 2016	September 9, 2016
Hearing on motions for class certification	June 22, 2016	September 21, 2016
Parties to serve merits expert reports (party with the burden of proof on the issue serves its expert report on that issue) ¹	July 18, 2016	October 28, 2016
Parties serve opposing merits expert reports	September 27, 2016	January 6, 2017
Parties serve rebuttal merits expert reports	November 10, 2016	February 20, 2017
Close of expert discovery	December 9, 2016	March 17, 2017
Rule 56 and Daubert motions to be filed	January 6, 2017	April 14, 2017
Rule 56 and Daubert oppositions to be filed	February 24, 2017	June 2, 2017
Rule 56 and Daubert replies to be filed	March 30, 2017	July 7, 2017
Hearing on any Rule 56 and Daubert motions	April 19, 2017, 9 a.m.	July 27, 2017, 9 a.m.
Joint final pretrial conference statement and proposed order to be filed	May 29, 2017	September 6, 2017
Final pretrial conference	June 26, 2017	October 2, 2017

¹ The parties may disagree as to who has the burden of proof as to particular issues that will be addressed in the merits expert reports. In the event the parties cannot resolve this issue between themselves, they will seek guidance from the Court at a later date.

	Event	Current Date	Amended Date
	Trial	August 21, 2017	October 30, 2017
l	Dated: December 4, 2015		
]	Respectfully submitted by:		
]	For the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs:	For the End-Payor Plain	ntiffs:
	Ys/ Peter R. Kohn Peter R. Kohn	/s/ Dena C. Sharp Daniel C. Girard (SBN 11	4826)
]	FARUQI & FARUQI LLP	GIRARD GIBBS LLP	
J	Jenkintown, PA 19046	San Francisco, CA 94108	
]	Facsimile: (215) 277-5771	Facsimile: (415) 981-4846	
		chc@girardgibbs.com	
<u> </u>	/s/ David S. Nalven	/s/ Renae D. Steiner	
1	David S. Nalven	HEINS MILLS & OLSO	ON, P.L.C.
4	55 Cambridge Parkway, Suite 301	Minneapolis, MN 55403	15
[Telephone: (617) 482-3700	Facsimile: (612) 338-4692	
		J. Douglas Richards	
			LLERS & TOLL
	New York, NY 10005 Felephone: (212) 398-0055		
l	ogerstein@garwingerstein.com		el for the proposed
1	egerstein@garwingerstein.com	•	
		Joshua P. Davis	
]	For the Rite Aid Plaintiffs:	Ryan J. McEwan	FIRM INC
		505 Montgomery Street, S	Suite 625
]	HANGLEY ARONCHICK SEGAL PUDLIN	Telephone: (415) 500-680	00
	One Logan Square, 27th Floor	jsaveri@saverilawfirm.co	m
			Trial August 21, 2017 Dated: December 4, 2015 Respectfully submitted by: For the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs: For the End-Payor Plaintiffs: For the En

1	Facsimile: (215) 568-0300 brefsin@hangley.com	Interim Liaison Counsel for the proposed End-Payor Class Plaintiffs
2	Monica L. Rebuck	For Disintiff Consumers of Francisco
3	Eric L. Bloom HANGLEY ARONCHICK SEGAL PUDLIN	For Plaintiff Government Employees Health Association:
4	& SCHILLER 4400 Deer Path Road, Suite 200	/s/ Todd A. Seaver
5	Harrisburg, PA 17110 Telephone: (717) 364-1007	Todd A. Seaver BERMAN DEVALERIO
6	Facsimile: (717) 234-3982 mrebuck@hangley.com	Joseph J. Tabacco, Jr. Todd A. Seaver
7	ebloom@hangley.com	Sarah Khorasanee McGrath One California St., Suite 900
8	For the Walgreen Plaintiffs:	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 433-3200 Facsimile: (415) 433-6382
9	/s/ Anna T. Neil Anna T. Neill	LOWEY DANNENBERG COHEN & HART,
10	Scott E. Perwin Lauren C. Ravkind	P.C. Barbara Hart
11	KENNY NACHWALTER P.A.	Peter D. St. Phillip
12	1100 Miami Center 201 South Biscayne Boulevard	Noelle Ruggiero One North Broadway
13	Miami, FL 33131 Telephone: (305) 373-1000 Facsimile: (305) 372-1861	White Plains, New York 10601 Telephone: (914) 997-0500 Facsimile: (914) 997-0035
14	aneill@knpa.com	RAWLINGS & ASSOCIATES PLLC
15		Mark D. Fisher Robert Griffith
16		One Eden Way
17		LaGrange, KY 40031-8100 Telephone: (502) 587-1279
18	For the Defendants:	
19	SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP	SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM
20	<u>/s/ David S. Elkins</u> David S. Elkins (State Bar No. 148077)	/s/ Steven C. Sunshine
21	Joseph A. Meckes (State Bar No. 190279) 600 Hansen Way	Steven C. Sunshine (admitted pro hac vice) Sean M. Tepe (admitted pro hac vice)
22	Palo Alto, California 94304 Telephone: (650) 856-6500	1440 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005
23	Facsimile: (650) 843-8777	Telephone: (202) 371-7000 Facsimile: (202) 393-5760
24	275 Battery Street, 26th Floor San Francisco, California 94111	Steve.Sunshine@skadden.com Sean.Tepe@skadden.com
25	Telephone: (415) 954-0200 Facsimile: (415) 393-9887	Karen Hoffman Lent (admitted pro hac vice)
26	David.Elkins@squirepb.com Joseph.Meckes@squirepb.com	Four Times Square New York, New York 10036
27	Attorneys for Defendants Teikoku Pharma	Telephone: (212) 735-3000 Facsimile: (917) 777-3000
28	USA, Inc. and Teikoku Seiyaku Co., Ltd.	1 aconinic. (717) 177-3000

ARNOLD & PORTER LLP 1 James Schaefer (State Bar No. 250417) /s/ Daniel B. Asimow 525 University Avenue 2 Daniel B. Asimow (State Bar No. 165661) Palo Alto, California 94301-1908 Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor Telephone: (650) 470-4500 3 Facsimile: (650) 470-4570 San Francisco, California 94111-4024 Telephone: (415) 471-3100 James.Schaefer@skadden.com 4 Facsimile: (415) 471-3400 Daniel.Asimow@aporter.com Attorneys for Defendants Actavis, Inc., Watson 5 Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Watson Laboratories, Inc., Actavis plc., Anda Inc., Anda Pharmaceuticals, Jonathan L. Stern (admitted pro hac vice) 6 Ryan Z. Watts (admitted pro hac vice) Inc., and Valmed Pharmaceuticals, Inc. 601 Massachusetts Ave. NW 7 Washington, D.C. 20001-3743 Telephone: (202) 942-5000 8 Facsimile: (202) 942-4999 Jonathan.Stern@aporter.com 9 Ryan.Watts@aporter.com 10 Attorneys for Defendant Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. 11 12 ATTESTATION STATEMENT 13 I, Daniel Asimow, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to file this STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER AMENDING SCHEDULE. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 14 15 5-1(i)(3), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in this filing has been obtained from all counsel. 16 17 **ORDER** 18 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, THE FOREGOING IS SO ORDERED, with the following 19 exceptions: Plaintiffs file reply briefs in support of motions for June 9, 2016 20 class certification and rebuttal class certification expert reports. 21 Rule 56 and Daubert replies to be filed March 30, 2017 22 Hearing on any Rule 56 and Daubert motions April 19, 2017, 9 a.m. 23 24 25 DATED: December 9, 2015 26

27

28

ON. WILLIAM H. ORRICK United States District Court Judge

September 7, 2016

July 17, 2017, 9 a.m.

July 3, 2017